

REMARKS

Claims 1-7, 9-16, 21-40 and 51-76 are pending in the present application. Claims 2-6, 9-12, 14, 15 and 21 stand rejected. Claims 22-26 have been allowed. Claims 7,13, 16, 27, 53-57 and 61-63 have been withdrawn and amended herein, and Claims 28-40 have been withdrawn. Furthermore, Claims 11, 12 and 21 have been amended herein. Claims 1, 51, 52, 58-60 and 64-76 have been withdrawn and subsequently cancelled. Finally, new Claims 77-82 have been added. Reconsideration is respectfully requested in light of the present amendments and following remarks. The above amendments and following remarks are believed to be fully responsive to the outstanding Office Action and to render all claims at issue patentably distinct over the references cited.

The Examiner's restriction requirement is still traversed. Furthermore, reconsideration is respectfully requested, especially in light of the present cancellations and amendments of claims.

The Examiner has objected to Claims 12 and 21 due to various informalities. This objection is respectfully traversed. Notwithstanding, the noted terms have been revised as suggested. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the instant objection be withdrawn.

Claims 2-6, 9-12, 14, 15 and 21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. This rejection is respectfully traversed. Notwithstanding, the noted terminology has been revised as suggested. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the instant rejection be withdrawn.

The Examiner has rejected Claims 2-6, 9-12, 14, 15 and 21 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Renner et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,403,135) in view of Frauenheim (DE 37 44 450). This rejection is respectfully traversed. It is believed that the originally filed claims are patentably distinct over the cited references. Notwithstanding, independent Claim 21 has been amended to state that the mandrel includes an enlarged head and that the ram pushes against the head of the mandrel. Support for this amendment can be found in at least Paragraph No. [0076] and Figures 2 and 4, of the originally filed application. In contrast, the cited references do not teach, suggest or motivate the claimed combination of features, especially as amended. For example, Renner et al. discloses pressure pieces 14 pressing against a flange 5, but not an enlarged head of a mandrel. These differences are significant. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the instant rejection be withdrawn.

New Claims 77-82 all fall within the elected claim group and species. It is noteworthy that Claim 77 includes a ram pushing against a head of a mandrel.

In view of the instant amendments, it is submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, it is requested that the Examiner pass the case to issue at his earliest convenience.

Dated: Oct. 12, 2005
HARNES, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

MLF/cmg

Respectfully submitted,

By:


Monte L. Falcoff, Reg. No. 37,617